

# INTEGRITY



**SUBJECT~ SPIRIT & FLESH**

June, 1950

Vol. 4, No. 8

# C O N T E N T S

|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| EDITORIAL - - - - -                | 1  |
| CHRISTIAN IN THE FLESH             |    |
| By MARION MITCHELL STANCIOFF - - - | 2  |
| GOD, INC.                          |    |
| By JOHN C. HICKS - - - - -         | 8  |
| ON THE REDEMPTION OF THE FLESH     |    |
| By EDWIN HALSEY - - - - -          | 14 |
| ONE AND ONE IS ONE                 |    |
| By ED WILLOCK - - - - -            | 26 |
| JOY                                |    |
| By DOROTHY DOHEN - - - - -         | 34 |
| BOOK REVIEWS - - - - -             | 45 |

INTEGRITY is published by lay Catholics and  
 dedicated to the task of discovering the new  
 synthesis of RELIGION and LIFE for our times.

**June 1950**

**Vol. 4, No. 8**

Published monthly by Integrity Publishing Company, 243 East 36th Street,  
 New York 16, N. Y., MU 5-8125. Edited by Edward Willock and  
 Carol Jackson. Re-entered as Second Class Matter May 11,  
 1950 at the Post Office in New York, N. Y. under the  
 Act of March 3, 1879. All single copies 25¢ each;  
 yearly subscriptions: domestic \$3.00, Canadian  
   \$3.50, Foreign \$4.00.

INTEGRITY is indexed in *THE CATHOLIC PERIODICAL INDEX*

## EDITORIAL



Each age and each organ of the Mystical Body has its special way of manifesting Christ. In recent generations it fell to the Catholic laity to imitate Christ's hidden years in Nazareth. Insignificant in national life, poor among the money-hungry, they seemed as nothing, but in God's economy were redeeming themselves and the times through a faithful humility. Now their children's children have a new mystical vocation. They are to **MAKE THE WORLD FLESH** again. They are to repeat the Incarnation in the modern world.

Secularism is a separation. The Church can be perfectly organized, without scandal, well-housed, and efficiently functioning, but if it does not penetrate the world it is like a soul in search of a body. The world can be rich as Croesus and ever so scientific, but if it does not have a soul it will be formless. A deep penetration of the modern world by Christ is the only answer to our current crisis. It will be a mystical re-enactment of the Incarnation, using a formed and transformed laity as the instrument of fusion.

So we need to know what another generation might have ignored—how to penetrate the flesh and matter of the world. Our forebears may have done well to run away, but we cannot run away. It is our job to redeem the flesh, and through it the material world.

To do so we will have to get some of our ideas straightened out, as we have tried to show in this issue. Our power will come from the Incarnation of course, wherein Christ redeemed the flesh by assuming it.

THE EDITORS



# Christian in the Flesh

*"It is never lawful to put asunder that which it has pleased thee to form out of a single substance."*

Not more than thirty years ago a hymn used to be popular in France, particularly in convent-schools, where tremulous voices earnestly quavered the refrain: "*Mort a la nature, mo-o-ort a la nature.*" This cry of "death to nature" was and is typical of a deep trend which has always existed amongst Catholics and always been resisted by the Church. Now the opposite tendency has begun to assert itself. A French Jesuit has written a three volume work entitled *A Brief for the Body*; a Spaniard has truly said of nuns that "the most supernatural is the most natural"; we Catholics in the United States are even inclined to give nature more than her due. Yet we still do not always know how to steer between the rocks of materialism and the whirlpools of spiritualism.

For this, "the age of materialism," is also an age of "spiritualism." It is significant of the decomposition of thought in our time, that matter and spirit which were joined by God should have been put asunder by man. Many, today, believe in matter alone, holding spirit a myth. But there are many too who despise matter believing it both unreal and impure. Much modern religiosity is unconsciously manichean, too simply identifying matter with evil, spirit with good. Gnosticism has come back to fashion in some psychological schools and certain Catholics have suffered a taint of this ancient heresy. Whereas materialism is obviously unchristian, spiritualism is more subtly so. Not angels only are un-incarnate, but, as the Church each Sunday reminds us, there are dark legions of spirits seeking the ruin of souls.

## Whose Is Matter? God's or the Devil's?

The order of the universe is hierarchical. God is spirit. Spirit in its essence does therefore stand higher than matter. But God does not despise matter. He made it; He saw that it was very good. And He so loved the material world He had made that He chose to send His only Son into it; chose to put Him into that most vulnerable of all corruptible matter, human flesh, in order to fulfill His own ineffable plan. While Lucifer, the "bearer of light," pure spirit if ever there was one, did despise matter, thereby cutting himself out of the divine order of the universe forever.

*"O God, by whom the dignity of human nature was wondrously established"*

We know that God fashioned man from the humblest matter of all, the least promising to foreign eyes. Is it any wonder that even some of the angels did not understand? Using the ancient clay that He had willed, He made it possible for earth freely to seek entrance into Heaven. He formed man that a handful of dust might find a voice fuller than the voice of the Seraphs to sing out His glory. There is in this God-designed fusion of matter and spirit a special potential for sanctity to which we must be alive now if we are not to waste our lives forever. It is not only in the particular case of the God-Man that this alliance is holy, but it is potentially so in every one of us.

### **Broken by a Fall**

The happy union of body and soul was broken down by Original Sin. After the Fall it became obvious that there was a deep wound between matter and spirit, not the less painful for being self-inflicted. All men have known it. Alone the Mother of God and Christ Himself did not feel it as we do, not being themselves afflicted by its cause. Even the greatest saints have suffered from this division. They have testified that the flesh is weak however willing the spirit; they have felt one law in their mind and another in their members; they are at times bewildered by their own actions, doing that which they do not wish to do and not doing that which they wish. The jagged blade of this division splits us apart day and night and were it not for grace, justice would be out of human reach and charity unthinkable. Without the special intervention of the redemption even the strongest soul would still be crushed beneath the weight of the Law.

*"and yet more wondrously restored"*

Dualism we saw is as old as sin. As old as Lucifer's sin in fact. To the pagan philosopher the body was a prison. To the heretic it was an ordure. But to the Christian it is an opportunity. In the light of the Church he sees it as the spirit's unique medium of development, as the soul's vehicle of movement toward God. He knows that grace will be given him ("Will my Father refuse the good spirit to them that ask him?") to make body and soul one again. It harmonizes flesh and spirit, binding both in mutual charity as first intended. All those who have lived as saints or died as martyrs have experienced this unity. They have rediscovered that accord of flesh and spirit which was Adam's before the Fall. They know again that original completeness for which



we were invented. A thousand examples in the lives of the saints show us this happy condition. Without it, they could never have suffered what they did suffer. Let us not forget that He, Who told us to take up our cross, also assured us that His yoke was *light*, and He does not lie. Is the quiet humor of Saint Lawrence telling his torturers to turn him on his grill "because this side is nicely roasted" not proof enough that his body was happily, peacefully ordered by his soul? No struggling fortitude could have borne that unstrained fruit.

If we go through the catalog of martyrs we shall seek in vain for another explanation of the beatific deaths we read of there. We may seem now and then to find specimens whom we can write off as masochists or as otherwise psychopathic. When we look closer we usually find that this impression has been created by clumsy or hysterical hagiographers. The Church is so hesitant of accepting supernatural occurrences as to appear almost skeptical. Sometimes she sifts and examines purported miracles for decades and even centuries. Although she knows that all order is God's own and that He can, if He wills, interject the lower order of this world with the higher liberty of Heaven, she also knows that in this crooked world such glorious intervention is rare indeed. Yet she knows too that in his first state, when man was incorrupt he was incorruptible. When he reconquers wholeness by conformity to God's Will, he again becomes *whole forever*, his flesh and spirit no longer warring against one another. That is why the Church considers it as contributory evidence of sanctity in canonization causes that the body of a candidate remains incorrupt after death. This wholeness of soul and body is God's imprimatur, His seal. We then know (if all else points the same way) that here has been a man living completely in God's Will, that he was in spite of falls and frailties a being completely integrated in charity. So too, in the lives of the saints, we see that many have suffered almost incessantly from bodily pains, these pains—as far as we can tell from the haphazard medical information which has come down to us—frequently have not been of identifiable and corrupting diseases but have been more like visitations from above, appearing and disappearing at God's good pleasure.

### Conversion of the Will

Sanctity therefore re-establishes the unity of flesh and spirit. Not unconditionally, for God from time to time allows His closest friends to move away from Him a little in order that they may then freely seek to draw still closer. Holiness restores our whole-

ness, but to become holy we must first be whole. In other words: "He will never find holiness who does not bring holiness to the search." This is one of those circles we commonly call vicious but might better call virtuous, for they are of the same tough fibre as the strong paradoxes of our Lord and are contradictory only on a specious plane of thought. Unto him that has more shall be given and from him who has not even that which he has shall be taken away. This is not mysterious when we reflect that sanctity is nothing else than complete conformity of our will with God's. If our will is one with God's, if we really want what He wants, and do not, as we mostly do, just wish we wanted it, then there is peace between flesh and spirit. Most of us carry about half-converted wills which torment us continually because they fail to transform us. It is worth remembering that it is *seldom or never the body that rebels but always and only the will*. If our will be completely turned to God, our bodies too will be His willing and even joyful servants.

It is not only legitimate therefore, but it is deeply necessary to love God with our bodies as well as with our souls. We have too long tried to be Christians with our minds only, not troubling to convert our flesh. But Christian masters do not wish pagan slaves and unless our bodies are Christian too they will do us poor services and our spiritual life itself will be sadly spiritless. If our senses are not for our love, they will be against it. If they are not completely taken up with our cause, they will turn against us when our forces are low. If we brutalize them, they will react like brutes. While if we take them into our confidence, show them our love, leave them exposed to the charm which has already won our mind's consent, then we shall one day find our senses—those wild creatures of God—playing as he intended, like gentle lambs around his feet. To love God with anything less than our five senses is to love Him more poorly than we would an earthly lover. Dare we love God less entirely than a man? Even if it were not unworthy to love Him with less than our whole selves, it would be dangerous to do so, for it would leave bits of our beings idle for other loves. We must then address not only our minds to him but our muscles and feel our dedication running through us like our blood, quietly and reliably vivifying every hair, every cell, until we are at last joined to Him entirely. Martyrdom is a sacrifice of the flesh that man often gives to earthly causes, to ideas, country, friends. God may ask this too, but He does ask much more. He demands the very breath of our being, the inward essence of every moment, the whole gamut of our



sensibilities. He demands that we put on the new man, not only in thought, but in our very flesh and bone, and asks all this in order that we may enjoy His world in its true nature with all things eventually restored in Him.

### **Two Gifts**

To make this change in us and to make its twofold nature clear to our shortened sight, God left us not a spiritual Helper only, but a bodily Sustenance as well. He left us His Spirit and He left us His Body. When we misuse the one we commit the only sin which He, the forgiver of sins, said could not be forgiven. When we misuse the other we eat and drink our own damnation.

### **Why Penance?**

Thus Our Lord did not leave aside the flesh in providing for our spirit's needs, but showed us how the two are bound together. Indeed in all His sacraments He has founded the invisible on the visible, and in all His lessons He has taught the spiritual through the physical. To feed our spirits He has left us that commerce with the Spirit of God which is called prayer. To feed this body of death He has left us the Body of Life, which is the Eucharist. But this is not the whole of His program for us. Christ spent periods of watching and fasting, and taught His disciples to do likewise lest they should be powerless against the spirits of evil. Why did Our Lord put all this emphasis on penance? Is the body then the enemy after all? Christ fasted and watched though His senses had never been disordered by sin. Yet this penance was not empty mimicry with the sole purpose of teaching His disciples. Fasting and all other penance whether physical or spiritual is remedial for the world. It is love's way of restoring the world's balance and is known to us as the Communion of Saints. Even when penance is bodily it is never intended to offend the body. As it is always the will which sins even when the agent of its action is the flesh, so penance is a means of chastening the will even though the body may be the agent through which it is achieved. As most of us have such a balance of sin on our books, the chastening of penance is directly needful for us and not only as a contribution toward the order of the world.

We have seen that our bodies can learn to serve God joyfully, but they cannot learn unless we teach them. Only people who underrate children spoil them. People who respect them educate them. It is only when we despise our bodies that we indulge them. To despise the flesh and to indulge it is the habit of the "intellectual." To sympathize with and yet chasten it is the part of the Christian. The latter has the greater self-love, for he loves him-



self as a wise father loves his child, while the former spends on himself the contemptuous kindness he has for a monkey in a cage to which he will throw some bananas or a pound of peanuts.

Our bodies have short memories and little foresight; they need exercise to keep them in training for their part in the work of salvation. The ascetic life is not a seasonal occupation; it is a full time, all year job. We do better to call it penance for that name keeps it warm with the breath of charity, and pride does not creep into it so easily. This thing Our Lord taught us shows us once again the profound wholeness of man when his will is turned to God. The practice of penance floods us with new vigor, with physical as well as spiritual wellbeing, with serene rejoicing. We find we can do two or three times as much work as we could before and do it better, and need but half the rest we did. The body, far from being cast down by the long prospect of renouncement, by all it must endure in the coming years, exults in so much honor and joyfully assists the soul. After having been so long blamed unfairly for the imperfections of the will, the flesh can at last claim its right to love its Creator and enjoy peaceful exultation in His service. It can take its place as a much needed collaborator in the work for which both flesh and spirit were brought into the world.

### **The Church Incarnate**

Through prayer and through the Eucharist and by the practice of penance, the flesh and spirit are made one again. These three Christ left us and the Church has always told us they were the means to health of body and soul, of the individual and of society. Holy Church has given us still other means, of precious quality, which we sometimes remember to use and at other times neglect. The divine liturgy, not just glanced through but *lived* throughout the year, provides a nourishment for body and soul and for the soul through the body, so richly satisfying, so infinitely glorious as only the light of the Holy Spirit could have invented and bestowed. For proof go look at the cheerful, healthy monks in, for example, a Benedictine monastery (their happiness and healthiness being in direct proportion with the holiness of their house). We now try, most of us, dutifully and painfully, to fit the Church into our lives. But until we restore things to their proper order and make our lives conform to the life of the Church, we and our society will be more dead than alive. For man and for society, for flesh and for spirit, to live the life of the Church is really to live at last.

MARION MITCHELL STANCIOFF

# God, Inc.

Science observed the mechanism in nature and discovered its tremendous energies. Technology has converted this life-like power to the use of man. In the clock of God's order nature only occasionally erupts, but under a Godless rationalization introduced by man, vistas of untrammelled powers of destruction have been opened up.

Technological knowledge has reached a peak in an age when two greeds are rampant: the greed for possessions and the greed for power. Even the greed for possessions ends in a lust for power. Under technology, power possessed by men approaches the limitlessness of the god-like.

These new powers demand enormous resources of money and men, and hence huge docile organizations. It may not be possible for man to become God, but a vision is emerging of *mankind* as God.

Some deplore the fact that these immense powers were discovered before man had evolved sufficiently to use them well. They forget Original Sin. Man cannot use anything rightly without the grace that flows from Christ's redemption. They are really working on a redemption-without-Christ, the creation of Superman and Man-made-God.

## Incorporation

An age which has rejected God and the Christian redemption seeks to make man God and to reach salvation by the redemption of technology. As the Christian is saved by grace and incorporation into Christ, Man-made-God can be presumed to seek salvation through incorporation into Mass-man. Mass-man will be God.

The clerk is to become Superman by incorporation into the mob. Where two or three are gathered in Christ's name the Holy Spirit is in their midst. Where the mob is gathered in the name of man, the prince of this world is in their midst.

There are two ways of incorporation into Mass-man. They seem to stand opposed but they are rather progressive stages of the mysticism of collectivism and technology. The second is the development of the first.

The first is the way of free desire. It is incorporation into the corporation. Men freely give their money to erect machinery because of a desire for the increase of money. For the desire of money other men freely give their labor. Technology takes hold and organizes men and machinery into a vast chain for producing goods.



The second way of incorporation is the logical answer to the mistakes of the first. These mistakes occur when human nature resists incorporation into a machine, even one that promises redemption by material goods. This causes strikes and other interruptions of the progress toward the redemption. Instead of finding man and machine incompatible, a continuing rationalization makes mass-man the end, and organizes men and materials into a completely regulated state technology.

The desire for money, as motive, is replaced by force. Machine is made flesh and flesh made machine.

### **The Prophets**

Man is the Messiah but in the present stage he is still becoming. The world awaits him and his prophets pave the way.

The prophets of the free incorporation say that he will come in glory in the state of free leisure. The economists, the industrialists, the advertising councils busily prophesy the new salvation.

The tone of these prophecies assures us that we are the chosen people and that our industrial wisdom, which already supplies us with more machine abundance than any other nation, assures us a final entrance into glory. By this abundance of goods and services we conclude our election as the greatest nation yet known.

But there are also false prophets over the horizon, those who favor the incorporation into the state. They also preach that technic man is the Messiah. They say that if the redemption is to come everyone must be forced into the work of redemption through science. If there is to be a Messiah, Mass-man must control everything through the Supermen.

Enemies of our capitalist way say there can only be one God. We say there can be two Gods who can trade with each other.

### **Intimations of Imitation**

The false prophets seem to have the better argument, if man is indeed to become God. Mass-man can only be deified in the omnipotent state.

If man is to become God, whether in the corporation or the state, he must have some of the qualities of God, or at least an imitation of them. Looking closely we can see some signs of this already well advanced.

### **Creation by Force**

One of the first attributes of God is the power to bring something out of nothing. Technology echoes this by giving Mass-man the power of creation by force. It exerts force upon nature of which human strength is not capable. It uses force upon inanimate

nature and upon men. Technological organization and the assembly line are force applied to men, as the press applies force to raw material.

All technological creation is creation by force and its sapping of nature for raw materials is force. This is opposed to the reaping of the husbandman who creates by love of nature, as does the artist or craftsman who uses nature according to its dignity, and molds it in skill and love.

Technology consents to do and tries to do what even God will not, force the will of men. Thus it inevitably ends up with a force organization, whether it be a social security pool or a completely servile state.

### **Determinism and Automatism**

In order to be Superman and Apprentice-God, man had to rearrange nature. Science discovered the mechanics of nature, the parade of energy and instinct that governed the worlds of mineral, plant and animal. This knowledge was applied in technology, so creating a new structure to operate mechanically. Man had to be incorporated into this new structure and trained to act only instinctively. He was surrounded by mechanical laws by which his acts were determined.

Those who controlled the flow of energy and money could control this master mechanism which prepared the new redemption of goods and services. As God had set non-living matter to run by physical laws, Man-made-God attempted to organize rational life to run as a robot.

The automaton is one of the means of imitating God's omnipotence. The increase in automatons has helped erase those annoying areas of life where men act as individuals and the gears become unmeshed.

The factory ideal is one big machine incorporating men and tools into an automatic system. Factory products are automatic devices for doing the common work of mankind and provide automatic pleasures.

The redemption promised by Man-made-God is an automatic paradise. It is a place where the incalculable human element has been removed from work, and where all the equipment necessary to this paradise is produced mechanically.

In this future beatitude each man will give his leisure completely to contemplation of himself as God.

### **Merit and Specialization**

Work has always been connected with salvation in the Christian dispensation. It is the way in which man, incorporated in



the redemption of the Cross, uses the materials of the earth to obtain merit and salvation. The incorporation of man into private and state collectivism came with specialization and the atomization of work.

Responsibility became a thing delegated and not personal. The redemption promised by Man-made-God was a thing added, not something in the self but outside. All the prophets preached that whatever evil came, drudgery, boredom, illness from over-indulgence, there was a remedy external to you, changing nothing interior, but poulticing the exterior.

This is the opposite of the Christian experience that reform begins in self-revelation and self-revolution. Sin has become something you can cut out of the brain, virtue a vitamin that you can buy at a drug store.

### **The New Grace**

Mass-man cannot become God by his own power. He needs an added power to raise himself to a higher status.

The Christian idea of incorporation into the Body of Christ, the Church, specifies that the individual is raised from his fallen nature to a life of grace, which is a participation in the divine life.

Since the prophets of Man-the-Messiah have rejected the Christian idea, science has substituted for grace the power of nature, made available through technology. This energy, running the gamut from steam to atomic power, has permitted the engineers to build automatons of untold possibilities by harnessing it with the chemical energy of man.

Added to this power of the engineers is the power of the financiers, the engineers of wealth, who through the manipulation of money have found a method of turning all the material wealth of the world into a liquid state. This is transportable by paper and pen. Wealth can be controlled and stored as the engineers control and reap power from water.

The combination of these two powers has made the Supermen, prophets of Mass-man, able to organize men and matter at their will.

Now they have been brought to the pinnacle within reach of that greatest divine power, that of annihilation.

### **Providence**

The supreme organization needed to bring about the redemption by technology, requires that Man-made-God assume the providential role of God.

The eye of God, looking on His creatures, sees every individual and every detail. Not a hair of the head is uncounted, not

a sparrow drops to the ground unnoticed. Mass organization has caricatured this total knowledge and control of God in its concern to regulate all of the details of life down to the last lettuce leaf eaten, the last assembly-line motion given its profit-or-loss status in the accounting books.

As God's providence moves all things inevitably toward the end of His glory, to which even men's willful evil contributes, so the capitalists have devised means to profit from a falling market as well as a rising market, while the collectivists make all things conspire to their ultimate world domination.

God cares for the welfare of His creatures through the workings of nature and the exercise of mutual charity among men, facilitated by voluntary organizations. Capitalism imitates this providential care by huge financial organizations, banks and insurance companies, which then naturally develop a megalomania, expanding through internal necessity into the welfare state. Each step of the process further enslaves those whom it materially benefits, until they are bound hand and foot, body and soul.

### **The New Sacrifice**

The Christian redemption was accomplished by Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross which is perpetuated in His Body, through time, by means of the Mass. When Western civilization rejected religion and God it rejected the idea of sacrifice.

In the new redemption of technology sacrifice returns. It can be best expressed in the words of Gilson, who was speaking of art: "The greatness of art should not blind us to its misery which is to sacrifice the man to his works."

The redemption of technology sacrifices the spiritual person for the Mass-God. Its prophets point to the works of technology and say it is necessary that man the individual should suffer for a materialistic society, to produce the new redemption. They do not admit that the disintegration of man in the industrial system is preliminary to his total absorption in the smothering state.

If man can subserve the free machine to produce goods, on the ground that he is free to fight for as large a portion of those goods as he can get, then it follows he can subserve the state which denies him freedom to fight for his portion, in return for a guarantee of an equal portion to all.

The assumption that because the social body benefits in goods, slave services are excusable, is the beginning of the slave state that says society is God.

The testimony of the Pope is: "The common good . . . cannot . . . find its foundation in the material prosperity of society but



rather in the harmonious development of the natural perfection of man, for which purpose the Creator destined society as a means."

### **The Permanent in the Changeable**

A man who builds a ship in a bottle, or a cathedral of matches, through arduous hours expresses a profound need in man. In a world that flows like a river he seeks something that he can make as his own, little by little, that will remain as a mark of his individuality after he is gone. He needs this especially when technology tries to imitate eternity by a perpetual motion wherein no task is finished.

Beneath all the changing days the permanent entity that is building to an unknown term is the Mystical Body of Christ. This is the Church which God organized to contain all the activities of mankind. Here through the power of grace men can work and their acts have an eternal merit. Here is the mystery of the personal and the social solved. This is the master plan set up by God to be filled in with the details of many lives, where the least are often the greatest.

In *Mystici Corporis* Pope Pius XII says: "In a natural body the principle of unity unites the parts so that each lacks its own individual subsistence; on the contrary in the Mystical Body that mutual union, though intrinsic, links the members by a bond which leaves to each intact his own personality."

This is the reality that has been ignored by men who try to lift society up by money, by technology, by force. This is the means by which man can indeed become one with God, through the love which God will bestow on those who ask for it.

JOHN C. HICKS



Instead of giving medals  
To those who peddle sex,  
Let's tie distinctive millstones  
Around their nasty necks.

# On the Redemption of the Flesh

*"God's anger is being revealed from Heaven, His anger against the impiety and wrong-doing of the men whose wrong-doing denies His truth its full scope. The knowledge of God is clear to their minds; God Himself has made it clear to them; from the foundations of the world men have caught sight of His invisible nature, His eternal power and His divineness as they are known through His creatures. Thus there is no excuse for them. Although they had knowledge of God they did not honor Him or give thanks to Him as God. They became fantastic in their notions and their senseless hearts grew benighted. They who claimed to be so wise turned fools, and exchanged the glory of an imperishable God for representations of perishable man, of bird and beast and reptile. That is why God abandoned their lustful hearts to filthy practises of dishonoring their bodies among themselves. They had exchanged God's truth for a lie, reverencing and worshipping the creature in preference to the Creator (blessed is He forever, amen) and, in return, God abandoned them to passions which brought dishonor to themselves. Their women exchanged natural for unnatural intercourse; and the men on their side, giving up natural intercourse with women, were burnt up with desire for each other, men practising vileness with their fellowmen. Thus they have received a fitting retribution for their false beliefs. As they scorned to keep God in their view, so God has abandoned them to a frame of mind worthy of all scorn, that prompts them to disgraceful acts."* (Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans)

Saint Paul could not be more specific or more insistent. He directly attributes the growth of sexual indecency to theological and devotional failure. There is no nonsense about what is subconsciously happening to the libidinal drives of the ancient pagans; nothing is said about childhood trauma. They have made the colossal error of idolatry, and the result has been dishonor. Modern paganism is simply repeating the whole experience, though, of course, with the added anxiety which comes of having once been Christian.

The irreligion of our capsizing civilization produces varying degrees of unrealism about sex. We have first of all that dwindling army of sentimentalists who simply trust in the persistence of the residual Christian sexual ethics while at the same time they repudiate every article of the orthodox faith which makes the ethics reasonable and binding. These people are given to talking



about the beauty of sex and to urging young people to be "healthy-minded" about it. They arm themselves with physiological charts and the poems of Robert Browning and suppose that they are ready to meet the assaults of lust. This is meeting the Devil more than halfway. It is a sure sign of a lack of vitality for it simply means that many people no longer know when they are in mortal danger. For years now "respectable" Americans have preferred to suppose that the old sex standards of a traditionally monogamous society were somehow being upheld fairly well despite all the evidence to the contrary. Such willful blindness is increasingly difficult to maintain. The young men and women of our generation who fought the last war have quite consciously adopted sexual standards which can only be called those of a decadent paganism. The worst of it is not the promiscuity. Sex has become so dominant a note in contemporary American life that many people cannot seriously put their minds to anything else; they are obsessed by it, enslaved to it.

When a people are sufficiently anxious to avoid a moral self-examination, they can find ways to make their hypocrisy subtle. Today a certain number of intellectuals, assuming the dubious posture of "social scientists," are telling us that Christian sexual standards are vestigial superstitions, mere barbarous taboos. They compare us with the Zunis and the Pueblos, and find us wanting. I think we Catholics must admit that the puritanism of Protestant culture has produced a prudery and dishonesty about sex which is part and parcel of the pride and imperialism of the modern Western world. But we can hardly suppose that the cure for our great faults is a chaotic relativism, a blowsy tolerance which is really mere chaos. If we know nothing of our history except the fact that we were once a Christian civilization, we should recognize that a society which has rejected Christ and one which has never known Him at all are necessarily very different, and cannot be considered on a cultural level. As Christians—those of us who dare to call ourselves the faithful—we can only deplore the ignorance of these intellectuals who have taken up their positions as an army of voracious wood-borers in the planks of our life-raft. The cultural relativists, as compared with the sentimentalists, have the sole virtue of consistency. They are consistently wrong. But both groups are busy attempting to mock God and He will not be mocked.

### **Freudian Detours**

The price of sexual promiscuity in a civilization is insanity and death, and Americans have embarked upon that disastrous

course. Critics of the American scene are unanimous in pointing out the widespread promiscuity and the growth of homosexuality. Perhaps someday, if sanity is regained, an historian of ideas will be able to tell to what extent the Freudian philosophy served to create that ubiquitous and omnipotent sexuality which it purported to "discover" in human nature. He will also assess its role in producing that sexual ambivalence, that blurring of the male and the female into the hermaphrodite, which we see all about us. We are replete with manly women and womanly men. Attempts to account for the growth of promiscuity and sexual ambiguity are as numerous as the critics of society and manners, but the great majority of them, in accordance with the prevalent naturalism of the age, avoid theological and metaphysical truth and are necessarily superficial and misleading. The search for the determinants of personality and temperament in the depths of the subconscious cannot possibly succeed so long as the moral will, which men use to prevent or to encourage self-knowledge, is overlooked. To begin a study of the psyche with elaborate topographical charts of hidden faculties, as Freud did, is to make a deliberate and rather stupid omission of such explanations as are readily to be found in the conscious motives of most men. What is required is a few observers with a talent for what Catholics call the examination of conscience, rather than an army of dreamers recording nightmares and gossiping about themselves to paid listeners. The besetting error of the psychiatrists has been to suppose that because the average patient has tried to forget God he has therefore destroyed Him and His laws. Such an error followed naturally on the heels of a religious tradition which had become subjectivistic and individualistic to a dangerous degree. All these guilt feelings which modern men are prone to find in the front of their consciousnesses are not so much due to repressed sexuality as to neglected religiosity. All too often the psychiatrists' treatment for a bad conscience is simply surgery—*animectomy* Sheldon called it—and this drastic damage to man's moral nature is more or less deliberate on the part of those doctors who share the hatred of religion which Freud celebrates in his writings. Freud chose his motto carefully: If I cannot move Heaven, I will stir up Hell.

### Manliness

Virtue and manliness have more than an etymological connection. In fact, as Virgil tells us, manliness requires heroism and Christian virtue means to be a hero in the spiritual combat which is life in this world. We seem to have lost all notion of heroism. A glance back at the bourgeois epoch out of which we are emerg-

ing shows a pervasive complacency and stuffiness which lacked nothing so much as any kind of heroism. No wonder life was so ungodly tedious in the nineteenth century! Lacking all exercise of true heroic qualities, except in the most brutal and criminal extremes like the robber barons and the imperialist explorers, the men of that century were never fully men, or perhaps it would be truer to say that, like a Hemingway hero, they knew no way to be heroic *at home*. Similarly our greatest problem today is to restore the moral fibre of twentieth-century Americans and Europeans, and the only possible means to that end is to restore spirituality—the love of God—to its central and regulative position in our erratic personalities. If we can do that, we may again produce brave men and gracious women.

In the last century the gospel of hard work attempted to pinch hit for the Gospel of Christ. What this meant in plain terms was that men tried to substitute their jobs for religion. Mammon was God. The most striking characteristics of the devotees of the gospel of work were their grimness and their prudery and an aggressiveness which was the opposite of the old Christian meekness but bore a resemblance to the Calvinistic sternness which had preceded it. Under the tutelage of the dismal theology of money men went to battle with the iron laws of scarcity and competition with nothing but the hard glitter of the gold standard and bitch goddess of success for inspirations. It is small wonder that they were so joyless at their tasks and produced so much that is ugly. Saint Paul is so clinically accurate in his diagnosis! When men fail to worship God in the fullness of His truth, they lose their own true natures. It is the tragedy of secular humanism. The deformation of man occurs first in his mind and spirit when he sets up human and animal idols to worship. With Darwin and Nietzsche and their kind, the nineteenth century ran the gamut of false creeds. The philosophers were constantly seeking to orient man in an environment which they had radically misapprehended at the start. The source of all the false doctrines of man in the last century was the prior assumption that the exterior universe was hostile to man. Malthus postulated a parsimonious nature which he had derived from the natural theology of Paley and Butler and which he passed on directly to Darwin. All these men had forgotten that nature is God's creation and servant, constantly and eternally within His merciful control and never separated from His providence. Eckhart had written long before the Reformation, "It is extremely dangerous to think that God is far away." How dangerous it is we now know.



The belief in a grim and hostile nature produced a grim "economic" man, cutting away from the personality the tenderness which is the thing upon which woman feeds. If our grandmothers and mothers were often emotionally virginal after years of marriage, and if they bore their children with increasing reluctance and overburdened them with possessive affection, no little share of the blame lies in the emotional insufficiency of their husbands. And we are the children of those explorers and pioneers and business men and their virginal wives, and our lot has been to squander and destroy what they discovered and stole. And our sexual promiscuity is in no small part a revolt against a killing respectability and a surrogate for genuine affection and tenderness. In fact although the promiscuity and carnality of our age is directly due to its materialism and atheism, the peculiarly anxious and feverish tone which accompanies these sins is in great measure a reflection of a misguided idealism, even of misapprehended religious truth. In itself sex is tempting, but it is not really "fascinating." Mystery fascinates, but raw and unadorned sex is probably the least mysterious thing in the world. It is impersonal and mechanical. Allowed to operate without limits it would soon reduce all personality and individuality to the dead level of physical uniformity. But in man sex is never left "by itself." Even in pagan Greece Aristotle was constrained to say that after intercourse all men are sad; animals are merely tired. Within the controls of Christian Sacraments sexuality and joy have been united, but our world prefers the pagan sadness. Our preoccupation with sex for its own sake, our effort to return to sex which is divorced from Christian love, must ultimately mean the loss of personality itself, just as it has already begun to mean the blurring of the distinction between the two sexes.

### Homosexuality

That promiscuity and license should readily include homosexuality in their range was to be expected. In the matter of physical endowment men and women are not so different that either may not be made to serve for purely sensual purposes. As far as that goes human beings with their risky status as relatively free agents in a moral universe are biologically and psychologically capable of auto-eroticism, and such checks as exist upon the dangers inherent in that freedom stand or fall with religion. The traditional disapproval of all these extra-marital and perverse expressions of sex which Christianity has fostered was part and parcel of the subjection of man's animality to his spirit, his sexuality to his personality. Christ redeemed sex from the pagan

sadness by instituting the Sacrament of Matrimony, and in religious and clerical celibacy He transcended sex entirely. In both states Christ gave man purposeful ways of living which required the waging of spiritual combat but which gained an eternal crown for the victor. Husbands must fight the Devil's temptations to be unfaithful to their wives with whom they have been made one flesh in Christ. The monk and the priest fight the temptation to be unfaithful to Christ Himself. In either instance the supreme benefit of the Sacrament is the finding of one's own soul, the perfection of human nature. When a man has nothing to fight in himself for God, he will either fight against his environment and his neighbors or he will fight against himself for the Devil. What the modern psychologists are calling masochism and "death wishes" seem to fall under this last category. And the tragedy of our time is that men who have the native endowment necessary to live the spiritual life in its heights often develop their understanding of their vocations only far enough to discredit the false standards of their fathers. They reject the standard which would equate manhood with insensitivity and toughness and aggression. Their mothers encourage them to have more tenderness and love of beauty than those older, imperialistic postures of their fathers will allow. But they all too often find for themselves only a sterile aestheticism which will not begin to disguise the desperateness and pointlessness of existence. Remaining passive themselves and refusing to participate in the grosser exploitations of their fellowmen and the world's resources, they nevertheless pay lip service to the same standards by thinking poorly of themselves for not living up to them. In other words the dissidents from the rugged masculinity tend to think of themselves as less than men because they have not found a way to express their own creativity. They accept the role of the sissy even in their own appraisal of themselves, which really means that they still conceive of manliness according to the canons of the tough. Sexually this attitude expresses itself as homosexuality, and in our depraved world there is little doubt that many good vocations to the priesthood, to the life of celibacy, and the service of God are distorted into this evil way of life simply because society makes no provision for the man who is not seeking domesticity, and our philosophy has denied him the adventures of the spiritual life. There is a popular myth which circulates among us as part of the decadent naturalism of the age to the effect that homosexuality is merely an inherent temperamental characteristic of a certain few people in every society. The degree to which it is a cultivated and artificial crea-

tion of boredom and materialism is overlooked, but the women seem occasionally to have a deep intuition of the extent to which this decadent art is a threat to their most "natural" prerogatives. Christianity is indeed woman's first and last resort, and she is coming to realize it. To the extent that she does she will gladly help to reinstate that love which surpasses the love of women which is the love of Christ for the soul, for she knows that in this is the foundation for the home and the family as well as the convent and the monastery.

### Quiet Neglect

There has been a welter of books about the problem of the "lost sex," i.e. the position of women in our society, and there would be many more books about the problems of the homosexual, whether male or female, if that subject were considered more discussable. English friends have sometimes told me that it is, along with psychical research, the only really taboo subject of discussion which they have encountered in visiting American universities. But such considerations of all these subjects as there has been in the press seem to come to no more than urging women to be feminine and men to be manly, whereas the real difficulty is one of understanding what those terms actually mean. If we are to judge from the Humphrey Bogarts and Greer Garsons of the screen there has been a real attempt, whether or not conscious and deliberate I can't say, to mark the polar sexes off in no uncertain terms in the popular imagination, but it is not very satisfactory. Moreover there is a great incompleteness to the sort of analysis of which we hear so much nowadays which attributes sexual aberrations to one or another form of parental mistreatment and childhood accident. Smother love is deadly enough, but it is never a primary cause of the personality problems which it helps to cause. The trouble is not really that so many people have Oedipus complexes and father-fixations, but rather that there are so few Christ-complexes and Mary-fixations. I sometimes wonder that so many Catholics should fail to realize that the traditional imitation of Christ and the discursive meditations of the Rosary and devotions to Our Lady are just exactly the sort of "fixations" toward father and mother figures which the psychiatrists deprecate. As Evelyn Waugh remarked about Geoffrey Gorer's alarm over the American "search for the father" (which he thought was basic to what ails us all psychologically), "Mr. Gorer should realize that many thousands of American Catholics are not only looking for a Father; they have found Him." At any rate there would seem to be some question whether we Americans are all



so dependent upon our mothers as we are said to be by those who decry "Momism." But I for one have no doubt at all that the overwhelming majority of us have not that proper regard for Our Blessed Mother which is after all the only safeguard of purity and sanity. American children are probably less the victims of the overprotection of their parents than they are of that awful insecurity which comes of ignorance of the providence of God. And when it comes to this matter of immaturity of which we have rightly heard a lot lately, it would seem that we can only be mature people when we are firm in our belief in and dependence upon Our Father in Heaven. It doesn't seem at all strange to me that some of our most talented and intelligent young men should hang on to their mothers, if those mothers are really the only source of loving kindness they have found in this world. It is sad but it is not very difficult to understand.

### **Incarnate God**

All said and done Saint Paul is just as accurate as could be wished in his analysis of the whole problem. He perhaps neglects to say one thing which comes to our minds about the irreligion of the pagan world which he is addressing in the quoted passage. The classical world's idea of God was necessarily inadequate because it lacked the Incarnation. There was that much excuse for their impiety. Aristotle's God or the Hebrew's Yahweh were not presented as very lovable. But our tragedy is surely the more pitiable if having benefitted by the divine pity, we should reject Christ. And it is just this which Protestantism and its secular offspring have tried to do. They have first lost the full meaning of the Incarnation and then tried to disregard it altogether. I can do no better than quote a famous passage from Karl Adam at this point:

Nearly related to the picture of Christ revealed in the Eastern liturgies is that of certain exponents of Protestant theology. With the rest of Christendom they acknowledge that Christ is the appearance of God in man. But in this true proposition they lay incomparably more emphasis on the first term, which speaks of God's appearance in man. That God, the just and merciful, was revealed in Christ, is for this theology the all-important fact. The significance of the humanity of Christ merely lies in the fact that we meet this God in it; that the great transcendent God appears to us in the Christ-figure with His words of judgment and forgiveness. Here too the humanity of Christ is threatened

with the loss of its import per se, of its significance in the scheme of redemption. Here too monophysite tendencies may be traced. The humanity of Christ is not much more than the sensible garment of the Godhead, the visible point where God's mercy and justice flash forth. It follows from this that Christ stands only where God stands. *Between us and this God who was revealed in Christ there yawns an infinite abyss which nothing can ever bridge, since no bridge was built by God Himself.*

That an absolute separation between God and man reasserts itself in Christian stoicism (for that is what Calvinism if not Lutheranism can be said to comprise), as it had asserted itself in pagan stoicism, there is no doubt. If there were any occasion to doubt it, it would only be necessary to recall the thoroughness with which the Reformers rejected Christ's Mother who intercedes for us with her Son, or the insistence which they have put (and which men like Schweitzer still put) upon the pure masculinity, that is to say the *sternness*, of their religion. This warping of the Christian revelation amounts in the long run to a loss of the Incarnation itself, and all the latter-day Protestant emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus (*Jesuanism* in the German) does not help to recapture the true doctrine. There is a manichean streak in Protestant ethics—we call it puritanism, it might just as well be called *catharism* except for the historical confusion it might cause—which is forever trying to say that the flesh is evil. This is an idea of purity which is the least pure thing under the sun, for it fails to see that in Christ the flesh is not only not evil, but is a positive good. Within matrimony, similarly, sex is not an evil to be annihilated, but a religious celebration to be enjoyed for God's glory. In short, the result of rejecting the full implication of the Incarnation, what Saint Paul calls "the full scope" of the truth, is that we thereby despise our own flesh and dishonor it as a consequence. There is no stranger paradox in Western history than the reversal of Protestant ethics in the course of the last four hundred years as it has moved from the original emphasis on the depravity of human nature and the powerlessness of man's will and the sole efficacy of God's grace to the strenuous externalized asceticism and athletic do-goodism which has characterized modern Protestantism. At the source of Protestant theology in Luther and Calvin is a misapprehension of the nature of Christ and, as a result of limiting the mercy and the condescension of God, Protestantism came eventually to lose trust in and reverence for

God altogether. By failing to accept His good gift of self-revelation and the fullness of Christ's vicarious redemption, Protestant Christians have been forced to seek redemption in themselves and have always been tempted to take the easy way out and deny that salvation was necessary in the first place. There is no doubt, as I have already pointed out, that there was an original intention to be humble before God, to debase one's self before His majesty. But it is a false humility which seeks to offer God a humility which denies His greatest gift to man. The error was an intellectual one perhaps but it was disastrous. Under its shadow men have lived with an idea of purity that they could neither achieve nor forget. The secularism which replaced Protestantism in the Enlightenment tried to forget it, but did not succeed. Most of the mistaken doctrines of the Reformers were one way or another woven into the philosophy of nature and reason by men like Rousseau. His *Confessions* is a most remarkable document in support of my thesis. For Jean Jacques all women were angels and by his own admission he was never able to have mature relations with any of his various mistresses. Perhaps his true vocation was not to the household at all and he might better have stayed in the monastery to which he was sent for his schooling. The romantic literature to which he gave his life served its useful purpose in restoring the sense of evil which the superficial rationalism of the earlier *philosophes* had tended to minimize. In fact romanticism winds up in a veritable worship of the Devil. But in all its course it seems to have been unable to produce anything resembling true men and women. Its Heloises and Amelias and Mariannes and Pamelas, its Emiles, Pauls, Juliens, and Rénés are not made of flesh and blood. They are disembodied.

Our modern American authors have rather chosen to write about Ishmaels and Huck Finns and poets-of-the-open road seeking something precious which has been lost—the fellowship of man. The last of their line is Hemingway who has yet to paint his first life-sized character.

A religion of immanentism and a religion of complete transcendence have one great thing in common—their mutual rejection of the Incarnation, their mutual guiltiness about the flesh.

EDWIN HALSEY





"We have this treasure  
excellence may be of the



earthen vessels that the  
power of God and not of us."

ST. PAUL

# One and One Is One

Marital fidelity is becoming scarce. Beside this fact all other symptoms of social disintegration are comparatively insignificant. Infidelity has been caused primarily by the ostracism of Mary from modern life. Without her, feminine modesty is ignored; men divide women into *good* and *bad*, and treat them accordingly. The specific for the social disease of infidelity is a restoration of dignity to women in public affairs by reference to Mary the Virgin, and in private affairs by reference to Mary the Mother.

## Apart at the Seams

Statistics and Kinsey Reports are not the most effective means of finding out prevailing opinions and customs concerning the impermanence of wedlock. Sexual inquisitions are not likely to evoke testimonies more intelligible than a blushing whimper or a boastful simper. No sampling of opinions is valid that limits the inquiry to those who not only are lascivious but are willing to brag about it.

I have heard tell of only one instance in which such a consultation resulted in a normal reaction on the part of the *client*. It was a first-hand report of a young man who did his part in World War II acting as secretary to various psychiatrists who interviewed reluctant recruits for the Navy. Those libido-explorers felt obliged to ask intimate questions to determine (each according to his own standard) whether the recruit was over or under-sexed. On the particular day in question the interviewee was a young red-head, newly married, who approached the encounter with a convinced belligerence.

In his best couch-side manner the psychiatrist asked his first routine question, "How do you get along with your wife?" My secretary-friend gleefully reported that the young man answered, "None of your damn business," and planted an ample fist in the beaming countenance of his inquisitor. Seldom does a psychiatric consultant establish so rapid and effective a contact with his client. The result contributes very little to science of course, and does not provide our healthily inquisitive minds with more data on boudoir mores among moderns.

Pertinent judgments fortunately do not depend inevitably upon the scientific method of investigation. Common sense and intuitive perception have always served men well and have not as yet been invalidated by Hooper or Gallup. The value of Kinsey Reports is limited. Royalties accrue to their authors; they objectify lust and thus, according to the modern mind, make it



respectable (everybody does it!) and, much like Christian apologetics, serve more to confirm already established convictions than to enlighten ignorance.

We have no need to snoop into intimate places to learn that marital fidelity is somewhat less popular than baseball. Anyone who has spent some fraction of his life in offices, shops, clubs, poolrooms, barracks or movie theatres, *knows* with justifiable assurance that husbands chase after strange women, and wives chaff under the restriction of one husband. Precisely how many couples remain faithful to one another out of convention, conviction or convenience may be a mystery, but everyone knows that *religious* fidelity is the quiet, unphrased conviction of but a minority.

The most convincing evidence that marital fidelity is disappearing is the disappearance of all those customs, habits and opinions without which fidelity is unlikely. Tandem polygamy is socially permissible. Monogamy is looked upon not as a virtue but as a feat of endurance. The unattached female is the idolized symbol of American womanhood. Even those who are faithful to their spouses connive via the movies with the evil liberty of flitting from flower to flower. Young people have abandoned the bastion of pre-marital celibacy and have raised their flags over fidelity to one *date* during a given period of time that becomes ever shorter. These customs testify more damningly than Kinsey.

### **The Common Family**

Infidelity is a mortal sin. That means you go to Hell if you do it. Infidelity is a betrayal of God and of your spouse, and of humanity. These are the best reasons for avoiding it. If I refer here to other evils which flow from infidelity, and provide other reasons for fearing it, I do so not because I feel that the argument of damnation and betrayal is no longer valid, but because I feel that too many Catholics who never question the need for fidelity in their own lives, pass off the fact of infidelity among their neighbors as a thing of small concern. Secularism has marked us to the degree that we regard as optional for others the moral sanctions which for us are obligatory. We cling to our own salvations and the integrity of our own families without compassion for the lives and families of others.

We are so calloused because we no longer regard life and possible salvation as a thing which we possess *in common* with all mankind. Our family is but one cell in the family of mankind and in the Mystical Body of Christ. If one part of the Body is diseased the whole will suffer. Marital infidelity is a social disease

tremendously contagious, that morally threatens the life of society and cripples the efficacy of the Mystical Body.

When the family which is the basic social unit disintegrates, then society is not only sick but it has lost the principle of its own recovery. Cracks in the wall of a building are not half as serious as the fact that the mortar which binds the bricks is turning to sand. Enmities between classes and cliques, races and creeds, are not so dangerous as the prevalent enmity between husbands and wives. All social contracts depend for their strength upon the strength of the marriage contract.

It is in the home that the child receives his instructions in loyalty. His entire universe is bound together by the love of his parents for one another. For this loyalty to be disturbed is to shatter the child's universe into fragments. From that time on the child will be wary of all confidence, and skeptical of all benignity. He will approach each new relationship armed with safeguards against skullduggery and deceit.

Many of today's adults have been thus disillusioned by the spiritual and actual infidelity of their parents. They were witnesses to bitter quarrels, tears and ruptures. They saw their fathers slam the front door and stalk angrily out of sight. They recall tearful notes, packed bags, and mothers' prolonged visits to relatives.

These are the children now grown up who close business deals, sign contracts, formulate laws, establish policies and marry. A lawyer's number is always in their phone book. Words are examined for deceit and contracts for loopholes. Clauses are inserted on paper and in their hearts that are evoked by premonitions of swindle, divorce, theft and betrayal. Everything must be written and an official seal affixed to guarantee prosecution if the party of the second part does a double-cross.

This paranoia reaches its ultimate in the U. N. where every speech demands quadruplicate qualification and definition. When Vishinski walks out he symbolizes a distrust of man for man so great that all attempts at unity are aborted.

Marital infidelity is a disease of the smallest cells of the social body. Disintegration of the entire body can only be a matter of time. When society comes apart at the seams it comes apart at the family. Marital fidelity, by the same token, is the only cement strong enough to hold society together.

### **Dispositions to Infidelity**

There are three basic causes of infidelity. The first is the modern ignorance of and lack of proper devotion to Mary. The

second and third flow from the first: the immodesty of women and the dual morality of men.

In the nature of things women play the supporting role in the family and consequently in society. Christianity confirms nature and recognizes this arrangement as judicious and satisfactory.

Human nature tends to degrade that which is subordinate. Those who are weak are most likely to be abused, whereas those who are strong and have social prestige can defend themselves. When Christianity made sacred a natural relationship between men and women in which the women became subordinate to the men, the relationship was modified by the fact that Christianity places Mary, a woman, as first among all created beings. Within the Christian context these two ideas are inseparable, that subordination is a means to the end of glorification, and the proof of that fact is Mary. The Christian home wherein the wife is subject to her husband also enshrines Mary as Queen of all created beings. The memory of Eve, whose feminine wiles persuaded Adam to sin, is erased by the presence of Mary whose feminine docility made possible man's glorious redemption. Through Mary womanhood is lifted up for admiration, and it is woman's very selflessness and willing subservience which is the instrument of her glory. Seen in such a light subordination will never be degrading, but will possess instead the dignity of queenship.

When Protestantism rejected the theological doctrines concerning Mary, and rooted out of their culture all reference to her, they inadvertently but inevitably degraded womanhood. They tried to retain the structure of the family without keeping the balance guaranteed by a love of Mary. The husbands at first became ruthless tyrants dominating the household. As Bible-thumping patriarchs they ruled the roost, providing women with only two alternatives: to be attractive but damned Jezebels, or else to be mousy matrons whose sole prerogative was to say "Amen" to their husbands' grace. Most significant in this tradition was the absence of any idea of feminine religious virginity. Dignity for women was something that could only be acquired by association with a husband, a brother, or a father. Apart from subservience to a man her life was meaningless.

This state of affairs could not continue for long because the shallow religious foundation upon which it was erroneously based rapidly fell apart. In the tradition of Mary men and women *set one another free*. Through mutual love and the exercise of complementary talents each made it possible for the other to perform



his or her vocation. The alternative to this mutual freedom is mutual slavery.

Mary had not only dignified womanhood, but by so doing had curbed the lusts of men, channelling passions in the direction of dedicated lives and good works. When she was ostracized, chastity went with her. Thus men became the slaves of women. Out of this emerged the two other dispositions to infidelity: feminine immodesty and the dual morality of men.

### Immodesty

When feminine immodesty becomes a social institution, as it has today, it indicates an attempt on the part of women to gain the prestige, dominion and privilege which is their due, but to gain it without the price of dedication. The characteristic of such a plan is that emphasis on dress will be in the direction of the strange rather than the familiar. That is to say, strangeness (seductiveness) in the woman is precisely the opposite of the familiar, the family-ness, the *mother* or the *sister*. The mother and the sister are female types which are *dedicated*, one to her husband and family, and the other to God. This dedication provides them with a certain sexual immunity which is normally expressed in their manners and clothing. When I speak of sisters I mean unmarried virgins within or without religious orders. Remember that it is only within the last century that the manners and clothing of nuns and unmarried Christian women became remarkably dissimilar.

Other than the mother and the sister there is only the *strange* woman, the woman dedicated neither to God (with or without vows) nor to a husband and family. It is this strange woman who typifies and sets the style for all women today.

An excellent example of this can be given by contrasting the manner and dress of the average office girl with that of the average housewife. The housewife dresses throughout her work-day to suit the nature of her work. She wears low-heeled comfortable shoes, a housedress which can take abuse and which permits freedom of movement for bending and lifting. She wears no jewelry for fear it might catch in something or become wet.

The office girl may do almost the same kind of work, that is to say, a manual effort of using her hands, bending, stooping, and walking. Yet her clothes are not at all prescribed by her work. She is forever breaking her over-long fingernails or chipping their paint. She is threatening the seams of her tight-fitting dresses, or catching frilly stuff on the corners of furniture. She totters around on high heels and splits her nylons bending to the

files. Her pretty dresses are quickly soiled and wrinkled. Maintaining this costume which is utterly awkward and unsuited to the work, takes a sizable portion, if not all, of her pay.

The reason for this madness is that the dedicated and familial type of womanhood no longer sets the style. The dress of the dedicated woman is prescribed by the function she performs. Today the strange woman sets the style. Every woman not a mother or a nun is per se a man-trap. That is the role to which society assigns her, pending the return of Mary.

### Dual Morality

Men would not be so susceptible to feminine immodesty were it not for the fact that they have developed a double standard of morality. They have an entirely different "line" and approach for the mother-sister type than for the strange woman. They feel manfully responsible to open a door or pick up the gloves of a *good* woman and yet they can laugh and joke and disparage the name of some *bad* woman, quite unconcerned as to whether she is receiving any gentlemanly consideration at all.

This dual morality has made men obtuse to various facts, such as:

1) Many young girls dress immodestly merely out of consent to the demands of fashion. The boundary line between dressing becomingly and dressing bewitchingly is not an easy one to survey, but the male instinct can detect quite readily all the styles that are south of the border. Many of those innocent young girls are unaware of the havoc they create in the male mind. They inadvertently arouse passions which they themselves would be most unwilling to satisfy. They precipitate infidelity and do not know it.

2) Strange women on the whole would be more than happy to become familial but are often prevented from doing so because of the attitude of *good* men who treat them as *bad* women. This was the theme of *Anna Lucasta* which was patterned (whether consciously or not I do not know) after the supernatural love of Christ for Mary Magdalene.

3) Many of today's sins of passion are provoked by the cold-blooded greed of landlords, price-fixers, entrepreneurs, magazine publishers, news distributors, fashion designers, store owners, etc. No Christian ethical code could justify placing those guilty of lust beyond the pale while those guilty of a more calculated greed remain inside. I hope that those who have by popular publishing introduced impure thoughts into the adolescent mind, or those who have demanded rents for hovels that despaired of

becoming homes, will some night lose sufficient sleep to meditate for the first time on the many and devious ways there are for earning an honest buck in a society that cares nothing about the souls of *bad* people. I recall faintly the story of the Catholic distributor of spicy literature who said, "Of course, I wouldn't let *my* daughter read that stuff!" Dual morality with a vengeance!

4) A dual morality exists without reference to Mary. All persons should be treated with the same love and respect shown them by Christ. He died for them all, saints and sinners alike. The dual moralist has fallen for the strange woman whether he admits it even to himself. He would prefer rather that she remain available as a *bad* woman than that she be restored to Christ and thus be lost to him.

### Restoration of Fidelity

Every material and spiritual aid rendered to the family in our times is an aid to restoring fidelity. Infidelity may come after the despair that follows a vain attempt to raise a family within a society that cares nothing about families. Above all the restoration of feminine dignity is the primary aim. This can be best accomplished by reference to Mary. Her relation to the dignity of women in public life lies in her virginity. Her relation to the dignity of woman in private life lies in her motherhood.

It is not uncomplimentary to the opposite sex for a woman to reserve her most intimate love and affection for God alone. It was through just such an act of virginal love that Mary gained access to the treasury of graces that flow from her Son. She loved God so much and man so much that she refused herself to any one particular man as lover. She wished to remain open to the persuasion of grace and the calls of the needy undeterred by an attachment to one lover.

In our time there is a special need for this kind of love to bind men back to God. Devout women with a great capacity for sacrifice, immune to disappointments, finding consolation in their Beloved, are performing an apostolic function that no one else can do. Committed solely to Christ they can accomplish various acts of restoration which would be impossible for persons hampered by dependents or personal attachments. These women are the tangible evidence of the return of Mary to modern society. They represent the feminine potential of mankind realized in the dedication of full lives and services to the needs of the apostolate. Their fidelity to Christ provides a pattern of fidelity for the married to imitate.



Within the family the potency of Mary is again being felt. At Christian family meetings couples get together and the presence of the wives at the Gospel inquiry is a reminder that Mary sat so often with the first group of her Son's apostles. The brittle logic of the men is being modified and vitalized by the direct intuitive judgments of the women. A new and grand conception of motherhood is taking root. The queen of the household is coming to reign, belieing the calumny that the role of housewife and mother is only for dopes and drudges.

Women in the home are imparting a new direction to the lives of their children. While men wrestle with Christian designs for a new society, the wives see already in the gestures and words of their children a new life growing in the awareness of the presence of Christ.

Marital fidelity will be restored, for Mary has come to live among us, showing us the glory of God that lies in a faithful heart.

ED WILLOCK



"MEANWHILE, YOU LIE THERE INDULGING  
YOURSELF IN YOUR BEASTLY ASCETICISM!"

# Joy

There is something ridiculous about joy. At least, it's supposed to have a strange effect upon people. If we talk about people becoming crazed with grief, we speak of their being delirious with joy.

This joy which takes a person out of himself, which makes him appear *insane* in so far as it makes him different from the run-of-the-mill people, causes him to behave in a way which seems ridiculous to them.

People smile at the joy of the couple who are in love. They have an amused half-understanding of it. They expect the lovers to do strange things, to have their heads in the clouds so that they trip over their feet. The joy which comes with love makes them unmindful of pedestrian affairs, and the ordinary routine of life can slide by unnoticed as far as they are concerned.

This love and this joy are crazy things. And they are recognized as such—so much so that if you do anything inane, like throwing the peas in the garbage and putting the pods to boil, anyone who sees you says, "Oh, you must be in love."

Love is a foolish thing, and joy is known for its follies.

Unfortunately, however, the people who are most likely to understand the folly of human love, often refuse to countenance the foolishness of the divine. People who smile benignly at the idiocy of earthly lovers take scandal at the saints whose lives were spent in the folly of love. They cannot understand Saint Francis caught up in the joy of poverty, traipsing around the countryside begging (*they* would have him sedately saving for his old age); nor Saint Teresa of Avila declaring with ecstatic joy that so great was her love that she must either suffer or die (to her they would have administered a pain-killer!).

## The First Fruit of Love

Yet folly goes with supernatural love more surely than it goes with human love. For the person who loves another on this earth still may think of himself, still may be calculating his own interests. But the supernatural love of charity at its height makes the soul completely self-forgetful, makes the person lose himself in the Beloved. As a consequence, he acts in a manner completely opposite to the ways of the world, to self-interest, and to his own honor and glory. He is in love, and he is lost in folly—the folly of the Cross.

The folly, of course, is the exterior thing which is noticeable. It comes from something within, however. It comes from joy which is the first fruit of love.

### **Forgotten Joy**

"That your joy may be full," prayed Christ, but a great many Christians don't have full joy, don't have much joy at all. To have joy one must be continually growing in love. There is no calling to love, "Enough." Rather love must increase, and as it increases joy grows with it. The mediocre are sorrowful, but the saints are happy. A little love places a burden, but much love liberates. Cramped charity weighs upon its possessor, it imposes duties, it saddens. But great charity carries its possessor aloft, it is above all law, it turns sorrow into joy.

It is tragic that there is so little joy in the world, because it means that there is little love. Religion has become a matter of responsibilities; penance imposes its rigors; Christianity is a duty, and for most people it is a dull one. In this sad, sinful world we don't bother about joy. If we do look for it, we don't look for it in the love of God. Religion is to console us, to dry our tears, but not to rejoice our hearts. For that we look to the pleasures of the world.

### **Perfect Joy**

Even fervent Christians, people aware of their call to be saints, often let the ideal of joy pass by, so bowed down are they with the problems and evils of the world. Yet joy is not escapism. It does not run away from the very real evils, the very pressing causes for pity and grief. But it knows above all the reality of God. The world is here with its sins, but the world will pass. God remains, God *is*. God is Love, and joy is the unfailing fruit of love.

Because God is Love, joy can be full. Because God is good, because His goodness is unchangeable, because nothing can disturb it or shake Him, because He is always the Supremely Lovable, nothing can destroy joy. Charity must be a tree bearing constant, lasting fruit; for the love of God there is no time of barrenness.

The joy of the saint is stable, consistent, abiding. To have it diminish, its Object would have to lose some of His goodness. But that cannot be. God is always what He is. The saint cannot do anything except rejoice in Him.

Human love can bring sorrow, for the object of the love can betray, or his faults may come to light and blind with their glare the eyes of love, so that for the moment at least joy is subdued. But the joy which comes with the love of God cannot



be subdued by any event. Never can the one who loves Him discover that He betrays the love that is given. Never can he discover anything unlovable in Him, anything defective, anything disappointing.

God is infinitely happy: that the saint knows. And because He is happy, the saint is happy.

In the fullness of charity, there is the fullness of unchanging joy. "Perfect love casts out fear" and in doing so it leaves nothing but joy.

### **Joy Mixed With Sorrow**

But what is this to us? We are too weighed down by the burden of this earth to know this joy. Our love has not soared far enough to glimpse the joy that knows no end. Our charity has not cleaved strongly enough to God the Beloved that it has lost its fear.

To us it means this: this is the joy we can strive for; this is the joy that Our Lord promised to us and for which we can hope; this is the joy we expect to come with our love. We can strive for it, but not in an artificial way. We cannot impose joy on ourselves. We cannot pluck the fruit unless we first grow the tree. So joy—the fruit—cannot come unless we cultivate charity, the tree.

In the saints this unchanging joy was accompanied by an inferior joy based not on God in Himself, but on their own tending toward God and on all mankind's tending toward Him. We are all called to participate in the goodness of God, but some of us are far from Him. When the saints glanced down from God considered in Himself, to themselves as still being exiled from Him, and to sinners being completely estranged from Him, they felt sorrow rush out to meet their joy.

In so far as we love and consequently already possess God, our joy is undiluted. But in so far as we hope for beatitude but have not as yet attained it, our joy is bittersweet. On earth our joy will always know this admixture of sorrow. Love is unchanging, but we have not yet attained eternally to the One we love, so we know sadness. Our sins cause grief; our own and our neighbors' ills make this a valley of tears. But always, always, above all this there must be joy.

We are Christians "on the way," so we cannot expect the joy of those who have arrived. But if we love, if we have the charity of Christ in us, we should feel an urgency to let it bear fruit in joy, in three aspects of our lives especially—in work, in recreation, in suffering and sacrifice.

## Joy in Work

The fact that we are supposed to have joy in our work sometimes surprises people. Too many of us have the idea that work itself is a hateful necessity, or an unavoidable blight. That work is arduous, or that it can be painful, is a result of Original Sin and our own personal sins, but work itself is not a curse. To share in the creativeness of God is a blessing, a privilege. It is part of human dignity that a man should be able to make use of the goods of God's earth, and to adapt them to the needs of other men. Work itself is a part of God's Will for man. It is God's gracious way of letting us serve Him and serve each other.

If we envision work as a service of God and man, it is evident that it must be done with love. If it is not, it cannot be done with joy. To be done with love it must be work which can be done with love. Some work of its very nature cannot be done with love because it is a disservice to men—like the manufacturing of contraceptives, or the selling of worthless stock. However, even work which can be done with love is not a visible expression of love unless a person does it lovingly. For instance, caring for the sick is of itself a work of love, but it is possible to do it without love, and consequently without joy.

To have joy, then, in our work these two things are necessary: that it is work which can glorify God by rendering real service to our neighbors; that we do it as a token of love.

These two things immediately reveal the unselfishness of loving work. It is not done primarily for profit, but rather that while we toil to acquire what is necessary for us to live a Christian life on earth, we may make our personal contribution to the good life of other people. That is what work is. Work, of course, has another purpose besides the one of providing for our material necessities. The discipline of work itself contributes to our spiritual good. Joy in work should come not only from natural satisfaction and gladness in our achievement, nor merely from the part we have played to fill our neighbor's needs, but also from the fact that our work gives glory to God and advances us along the road to Him. This should be true of all work, manual as well as mental, making a chair as well as writing a book.

It is obvious that the work of a wife and mother is of the kind which fulfills the requirement for loving work. That there has been so much written on "household drudgery," and that so many women find little cause for joy in housework, merely prove that we have lost the correct concept of what makes our work

good and what makes for dignified work. Thus, modeling sexy dresses is considered glamorous and dignified, whereas washing babies' diapers is definitely "dirty work." We judge the "clean-ness" of the work not on how it soils the soul, but on whether or not it soils the hands. Yet once people have become convinced Christians so that the Christian philosophy of work is part of their being, they come to experience the truth that joy comes from work in so far as it is an expression of love. You may get a backache from scrubbing the floor for your family, but you will find joy in doing it. Whereas you may be set up in a comfortable office, but if you are doing work that is serving mammon instead of man you will find no joy in it. Similarly, a poor farmer who conforms his work to its true purpose can have real joy, rather than a successful business man reaping huge, unjust profits; a laborer digging a road, rather than an advertising executive figuring out ways of making people more conscious of material things. Work that supplies the true needs of man is good work, whereas work that devises and manufactures false needs for him is never a genuine service of love.

Because man is what he is, it is natural that he should be able to work with joy if his work is a personal thing, if his contribution of service is to another person. That is why the more impersonal we make production, and the more we remove the worker from those who are to share the fruits of his toil, the harder it is for him to work with love. For example, it was easier for a shoemaker who knew the person for whom he was making the shoes to work with love, than it is for the man who works today in a large shoe factory, performing only one operation on the shoes, with no responsibility for their being well-made, and never knowing the people who will buy them. It is difficult for him to see in such work more than a "job," or conceive of it as being a service of love. A Young Christian Worker employed in a factory manufacturing cans told me that it was impossible to come to a realization through the job itself of anything approaching the Christian philosophy of work.

Men can find most joy in work which is of genuine service, which utilizes their talents, and for which they can have at least a measure of responsibility. How then can all the people whom necessity forces to do work in which there is little opportunity for genuine service, or in which there is no regard for their dignity as human beings, find joy in their work? Is it possible to work with love if the work itself goes against the grain? It seems to me that there are two things to be considered if we try to give an



affirmative answer to this question. The first is that an apostle in a factory where the work itself is inhuman and of itself unloving can work with love, not for the work itself but *for the workers*. He can find joy not in the work but in his compassion and service to those who are obliged to do it. The second thing is that work which cannot give joy because it is an affront to true human dignity can be turned to the service of love by making of it a *sacrifice*. It is possible then to find joy not because of the work but in spite of it.

### Joy in Recreation

We think of recreation as relaxing ourselves, in throwing off all the work, cares and tensions of the day so that we can go back to our ordinary occupations with renewed spirit, refreshed and invigorated. At least that should be the purpose of recreation. It has been said repeatedly, so that it needs mere mention here, that the real end of recreation is to enable us to work well, to get on with our real purpose in life—and not, as many people feel today, that the purpose of work is to give us money and leisure to recreate.

Recreation is necessary because we need a change of occupation. Too often people now want recreation because they hate their work, because they want to escape the horrible reality of it. But the spirit of true recreation does not "want to get away from it all." One can be quite content with one's work, quite willing to face the reality of living, and still enter into the spirit of recreation. In fact such a person is more qualified to do so than any other; for his life is well-ordered. He loves his work and finds in it the means of loving his neighbor. It is normal therefore that from time to time he should desire to relax and express his love for his neighbor in another way, namely, by enjoying himself with him.

The trouble is now that recreation too often, even when it is devoid of sin, is not a shared joy. Five hundred people attending a movie are separate entities, each alone with his thoughts and sorrows. There is no thought of the person who sits next to him; no joy in enjoying himself with others. Love is a social thing, and so is true joy. Remember in the Gospel the woman who had found what she had lost, calling her neighbors in and saying, "Rejoice with me." It becomes immediately evident that she could not have achieved the same delight, nor shared her pleasure, by saying, "That's fine. I'll go to a movie by myself to celebrate."

The second thing often evident about recreation today is that people don't want to be bothered "calling the neighbors in." They

don't want the trouble. Consequently there is missing the real joy in socialized relaxation. Social gatherings at home admittedly are work. Guests have to be served. But love finds joy in serving. It's been a traditional saying for Christians that, "Comes the guest, comes Christ." Love sees His likeness not only in the tramp who comes begging, but also in the friend who comes to call. To contribute to our neighbor's enjoyment in recreation as well as to his need through our work is one of the pleasant tasks of love. The Christian hostess seeks to serve her guests, to share her best with them, even if she is poor herself. One of the obvious reasons why people refuse to entertain today is that the idea of having guests has degenerated from the Christian ideal of rejoicing together in Christ, to the bourgeois ideal of "showing off" and outdoing one's neighbors in the quality of the food and drink and the appointments of the home.

Sharing common problems and common griefs keeps people together, but why not also the sharing of a common joy proceeding from a common love? People who really enjoy themselves together generally want to keep in touch with one another.

If there is to be true joy in recreation, it must be unselfish. We do not think of amusing ourselves so much as of sharing joy with others. For this reason we make the effort to join in the fun even if we are not in the mood. The person playing the piano for everyone else to sing even when he is depressed is like Saint Teresa of Avila who danced at recreation in her most desolate hours. Christian joy rises above moods and transcends the exigencies of temporal cares. This may be hard for people of a serious nature. If you're naturally the "life of the party," there's no problem. If you're not, there is no need to be discouraged, nor to feel that joy is not for you. The joy of Christ is not given to those who have great natural wit, nor to those who have natural charm and the ability to attract people, but to those who have His supernatural love in their hearts.

I was delighted when I discovered that Saint Thomas Aquinas finds virtue in mirth. Since we are called to enjoy ourselves together in Heaven, why not do it together with Christ on earth?

### **Joy in Sacrifice**

"Sacrifice is hard and irksome. Only love can make it easy, and perfect love makes it a joy," the priest reminds the couple whose marriage he is about to bless. It is recognized that their life together will have its difficulties, that it will exact from them many sacrifices, but the Church reminds them that their love can rise above the difficulties and sweeten the sacrifices. If the love

is strong enough, the hardships will even become joys. This is realized by all who love ardently and unselfishly. A girl can leave a comfortable home to live in a tenement with the man she has married—and be happy if she really loves him.

I visited a woman once who had just undertaken the care of a foster child. She was in her fifties. Her own family of six children were all grown up. I asked her why she had taken the child, and she told me that as her own children went from her one by one, and life became easier, she realized she wasn't as happy as she used to be. The happiest years of her life were when the children were coming and she and her husband struggled to keep going. Her mother, who lived with them, was bedridden and had to be waited on hand and foot. It was hard, but she always knew joy. Now life was easier; she didn't have as many sacrifices to make, but she felt that something was missing. That is why she had wanted the foster child. She said some people told her she was wrong, that she and her husband should think of themselves and not be making fresh sacrifices. A very simple person, she sensed that she was out of step with the rest of the world without quite knowing why. She asked, "Are we wrong? Should we be thinking of ourselves instead?"

Love thinks of another, and joy is most evident in sacrificing for the loved one. That is the rule of joy for natural as well as supernatural love. Not that there is any divorce between the two. Supernatural charity ennobles and elevates human love, and extends first of all to the ones closest to us by nature. That is why the joy in marriage will be keenest if husband and wife sacrifice for one another's eternal bliss, aiding each other to participate in the goodness of God. The same thing holds true for sacrifices for their children. The mother who has made sacrifices for her children which bring only bitterness is generally a mother who sacrificed because of her own worldly, selfish ambitions. The sacrifices that proceed from pure, unselfish love inevitably bear fruit in joy. That joy is not always apparent—sometimes it may be mixed with sadness, for despite her efforts her children may fall away from Christ. Nevertheless, the joy of her love is there, and she can tranquilly persevere.

### **Joy in Suffering**

That joy in this life should become greatest when it is the fruit of the love grown in sacrifice and suffering is one of the recognized paradoxes of Christianity. It is not a surprising one in the light of the life of Jesus Crucified. For love does not rest until it has been transformed in the Beloved, and the Christ we



have been given suffered agony. That is why, for anyone who has advanced a distance in the love of Christ, there is the simple knowledge (above reason, not produced by human thought) that happiness increases in proportion as one suffers for love. The saints found perfect joy in suffering. Saint John of the Cross, in an excess of love and joy, wanted never to pass a day without suffering. Christ was most truly our Lover on the Cross; we most truly love Him when we are crucified. It is this fact which all the saints knew—whatever might be their differences. They lived by it—however varied from one another might otherwise be their mode of life. There is always that note of sameness as they discover this amazing thing: that Heaven on earth must be a Heaven of suffering. Léon Bloy has his heroine of the *Woman Who Was Poor* say that "One is already in Paradise when one is poor and is crucified." She simply repeats in her own variation what all the saints have known, each according to his personality. Saint Therese exclaimed, "How great is my joy at having no joy!"

The point to be emphasized is that this joy in suffering is not a "felt" joy. There is no emotion in it. The saint has not come to feel pleasure in pain. The joy is the result of charity which resides in the will. Love transforms him in Christ Whom he loves, and suffering unites him ever more closely to God. That is why there is joy.

The saints realize that all they can do is love. In so far as they love, they are happy. But love demands that the Beloved be glorified, and is sad because He is not. That is why suffering is a necessity for love on earth. The love of neighbor urges that he should be brought to the love of God. Consequently, there must be a repetition of the redemption. There must be union with Christ Crucified on Calvary.

The joy of the saints—this joy which is only satisfied, only increased by suffering—what is it to us? To us the Cross is only pain. To us it has not become the same as happiness. Are we to counterfeit a joy we do not feel?

The answer is, of course not! We should not and cannot manufacture joy. We cannot have joy in suffering until we have love for suffering. And we do not have that love if our charity is a weak, pitiful thing.

The way to get God to increase our charity (that our joy may be full) is "to be faithful in that which is least." It is to do the Will of God. Fidelity to the commandments, to our duties, and to the practice of acts of charity, prepares us to bear our Cross. For doing the Will of God disposes us to accepting the

Will of God when His Will means suffering. According to the measure of our love we accept suffering. Before we can embrace the Cross, we must accept the Cross. Before we can learn to suffer with joy, we must learn to suffer. The one prepares us for the other. If we do our best to bear our trials well, uncomplainingly and with the graciousness which is within our power, God will increase our love and gradually teach us to suffer with joy. But learning to find joy in suffering is a lifetime task. We must grow up to it. The joy of suffering is a great joy, but it must come from a great love. We do not expect a baby tree to yield great fruit. Similarly, we should not be discouraged if we cannot yet find joy in suffering. When our love matures the joy will come. Meanwhile, let us accept the suffering as best we can. If we feel the pain more than the joy, or if the joy is non-existent as far as we can see, let us not be perturbed.

In this matter of suffering it seems to me easier to imitate Christ than the saints. If we cannot rush to welcome suffering as they did, we can say with Christ, "Father, if it be possible let this chalice pass from Me. Nevertheless, not as I will but as Thou wilt." Christ—more than any saint—rejoiced in the Cross, that by it He might glorify the Trinity and redeem men. But it was good of God to let His words be recorded, to bolster our courage and give us the example of triumph over the natural revulsion to pain.

Accepting the Cross prepares for embracing the Cross. Our attitude toward suffering changes little by little as our love grows. It is very hard to accept suffering at first, but what joy it is to find after many years that one no longer accepts but embraces!

The problem of suffering and joy and pain has become exceedingly simple. That the Cross is His Will is enough. Then there is delight in it. With His grace we embrace it. For the Cross is His Will, and His Will is Himself, and He is our Beloved.

It is true, of course, that in every manifestation of His Will the eyes of love can see cause for joy. The heart which loves is newly enkindled at every sign of the love of God, and everything that happens is a sign of love. Why then single out suffering? It is because in suffering, more than in anything else, the soul keeps nothing and gives all. "Greater love than this no man hath," and in a mystical manner the soul who loves much gives, in suffering, his life for the Beloved.

### **All Must Pass**

By grace we participate in the life of God; through charity we are united to Him; with joy we delight in His goodness. This

joy we know on earth is a faint foreshadowing of the joy of Heaven, when in beatitude we shall rejoice in Him forever. We read in the Scriptures that faith and hope will pass away, and with them will end suffering and sorrow. Faith and hope are for those on the way, who have not yet attained to the happiness of Heaven. Suffering and sorrow are for those who must lament, for they have not yet seen the Face of God. But all this must pass. Love alone will remain—and with love joy forever!

DOROTHY DOHEN



Sex of one, and half a dozen of the other.



## BOOK REVIEWS

### How Not to be a Nunk

**MENTAL PRAYER AND MODERN LIFE**  
A Symposium of articles transl. from the  
French "Cahiers de la Vie Spirituelle"  
Kenedy, \$2.75

"Nunk" is a colloquialism of the lay apostolate designating someone who "is neither a nun nor a monk but wishes

it were." It is not meant unkindly. The trouble with nunks is that, wanting to become holy in the lay state, they have no other pattern for holiness than that devised for religious. It is not their fault if they become "little religious," always hurrying to church services, using every tiny interval of the day to get on with the divine office, and engaging in spiritual practices like custody of the eyes. The working out of a practical road to holiness suited to the lay state has lagged behind the thirst for holiness on the part of the laity. Therefore this symposium of articles is most welcome. It deals with modern prayer in general, converging on the problems of lay spirituality. There is a long introductory historical article, and then a discussion of methods of prayer centering around the *spiritual exercises*. The last "practical" section is directly on lay spirituality. Two articles interested me most.

"Making One's Life a Prayer," by J. M. Perrin, O.P., takes up what the author calls *the prayer of life*. Everyone has to withdraw for formal prayer sometimes, even busy laity, but where the time available is limited this prayer of life must be developed. It means establishing vital contact with Christ in every life situation, not as withdrawing from daily events, but as seeing and acting in them with an eternal perspective. The whole doctrine of the Incarnation is underlying, since through it the whole earth was redeemed and is no longer enemy territory. Very pertinent is Saint Catherine of Siena's answer to someone who complained of how hard it is to strive for perfection in the press of temporal affairs: "It is you who make them temporal." *The prayer of life* is not simple to attain. It involves using one's whole life for God and achieving a profoundly Christian mentality.

The other article that strikes me particularly is "Putting the Gospel in Our Midst" by a leader of a girls' white-collar Catholic Action section. She talks about *the method of the Gospel lived*, which is familiar to all those in the Jocist-type movements. It uses the Gospels as a basis for regular discussion of "how does this action or saying of Christ apply to my life?" and is followed by application in one's daily life.

*The method of the Gospel lived* has many advantages. It is a return to *the* primary source. It is suited to all people from the simplest to the most learned. It necessitates a supernatural approach to life and a high heroism, because that was what Christ taught and lived. It cuts right through all the casuistry and the neat distinctions, carefully misapplied, with which even practicing Catholics are wont to delude themselves. Recently I heard of a Catholic college student in New York City who argued seriously that it wouldn't be right for her to give away one pair of the thirty-five pair of shoes she owns because she has to have matching shoes for each outfit, because she has to dress becomingly to her state in

life (which is rich bourgeois). Just the act of taking the Gospels as the standard, rather than social custom, legalities or advertising, is the preliminary to a Catholic renewal.

CAROL JACKSON

## Making the Ordinary Extraordinary

### FITTING GOD INTO THE PICTURE

By Mary Lewis Coakley  
Bruce, \$2.50

Before I could get around to reading this book to review it, three members of my family read it and their in-

terest and enthusiasm were such that I was more than well-disposed toward it. Mrs. Coakley wrote her book for the ordinary person who hasn't thought about leading a spiritual life, particularly for the average Catholic woman who doesn't lead a mortally sinful life, but at the same time isn't intent on seeking Christian perfection. Mrs. Coakley aims to show where what her one aim in life should be, how her love of God must express itself in the commonplace duties and details of living, what means she can use to grow in holiness and happiness. There are chapters on the married state and the single life, on suffering and bereavement. The chapter on prayer is especially good; the author's suggestions are practical; her examples excellent.

There is the temptation to judge the book on what it doesn't say rather than on what it does say. Mrs. Coakley covers a great deal of ground and covers it well. I wish, however, that she had put more stress on the Catholic's duty to be *apostolic*. She does devote a considerable space to the influence we should have on non-Catholics in helping to convert them, but she rather neglects to give her readers a realization of their part in helping everyone in their environment—Catholics as well as those outside the fold—to judge, act and live as Christians. As is natural I suppose, the author spends most time on those problems which were particularly apparent in her own life—for example, the problem of having a non-Catholic husband. This is given more space in the chapter on the married state than is given the problem of to-have or not-to-have children, or to the matter of raising children properly. (If we are going to be saints, shouldn't there be more emphasis on raising our children to be saints?) These two latter subjects, since they are fairly universal in contemporary marriages whether mixed or otherwise and since they profoundly affect the personal spiritual life of the married woman, seem to demand further and deeper consideration than they receive in this book.

The single girl who reads this book will probably get the impression that in the chapter on the single life when Mrs. Coakley lists the unmarried woman's assets, she is thinking of older women who have a greater measure of independence and control of their own life than the girl who goes to work but lives under the parental roof. I am sorry the author didn't treat more particularly this in-between state of the girl who is unmarried but as yet not settled in the single state for life.

Some readers may object to the abundance of catch phrases, but this is a minor point. Mrs. Coakley's book is written simply and sincerely and I have no doubt that it will do great good.

DOROTHY DOHEN

## Christopher Dawson

RELIGION AND CULTURE  
RELIGION AND THE RISE  
OF WESTERN CULTURE  
By Christopher Dawson  
Sheed & Ward, \$3.50 each

When the future historian describes the Catholic Renaissance of the twentieth century, it is my guess that he will pay particular attention to the emergence, during the great wars and at the darkest moment before the

dawn, of the great "doctors" who were the prophets of the new age. He will point to men like Etienne Gilson and Jacques Maritain and Edward Watkin and, certainly, to Christopher Dawson. Perhaps he will see that with these erudite and devoted men, the Church moved out of that state of seige in which it had been living for four centuries and assumed her rightful role of leadership in the West.

Christopher Dawson is not a controversialist. He is a confident, intellectual Catholic, who by a life of dedicated research has become the greatest living sociologist and philosopher of history, although not as yet the best known. I have heard him criticized for not making his Catholicism more explicit or, perhaps, more belligerent, but it is his greatest strength that he is not required to do this. He shows us that we must be Catholic (and that in the greatest sense) to understand the meaning of history and human society, but he allows the natural desire of all men to understand to do his pleading for him. It is a great source of gratification to all Catholic scholars that his authority is of that unquestionable and self-validating sort which simply cannot be ignored by the serious student of these fields.

"Religion," says Dawson, "is the key to history." It is his insistence upon the primacy and autonomy of religious knowledge in the formation of any human culture which is Dawson's unique contribution. Religion is not explained away; it is taken as the origin, the focus, and the completion of culture. The illumination which this basic principle adds to cultural analysis is truly splendid. The cramping assumption of the naturalistic anthropologists by which primitive peoples are taken to represent merely the childhood of the human race, drops away. Primitive societies are not merely young, they are backward or retarded. Conversely any culture however ancient its tradition and however long its "memory" can decay through stupidity and sinfulness in surprisingly short order. There is no automatic progress and no amelioration of things by the simple passage of time, but where religious and moral disciplines are properly understood and maintained a culture can progress—but only on these conditions.

*Religion and Culture*, published last year, deals with the general problem. With masterful erudition and the power of sweeping but sound generalization which is the essence of creative scholarship, Dawson surveys in it the various types of cultures and draws archetypal patterns from them. The most permanent and necessary institutions in human culture are seen to be the priesthood and kingship, with the prophet, who seeks direct communion with God, purifying both and providing the dynamic element in cultural change. Here readers will be reminded of the best insights of Bergson and Toynbee and Sorokin, not to mention the Old Testament itself. Dawson's opening chapter on Natural Theology is an historical treatment of the problem of faith and reason in which he



demonstrates the inseparability of the two in a balanced religious tradition. There is no genuine incompatibility between the mystic and the rational theologian. In order that the mystic's vision shall be mediated to mankind at large, the offices of natural theology are strictly necessary. Although there can be no real culture without religion, a developed culture may cast away its religious foundations. Culture may be said to be the incarnation of religion in human society, and all religions, even those which make least allowance for the natural capacities of man, become incarnate in cultures to some degree. In a negative way this might even be said of such contemporary pseudo-religions as Nationalism which call upon Chthonic powers rather than upon God. They do not hallow the lands over which they brood but they produce "brown lands" where there is no genuine culture but only technology and a coercive and mechanical organization. At the opposite extreme Catholicism, as even a non-Catholic like Professor Northrup observes, permeates the minutest facets of daily living in those countries where the Church has developed ancient cultures. Even so, if the religious center be repudiated, "the old dragon underground," as Milton called it, is ready and waiting to emerge. The lack of a rational appreciation of the role of religion in any human culture, i.e. the absence of a natural theology, is a standing invitation to this sort of disaster. "If there is no true knowledge of the object of religious experience, religion loses its validity and even its social coherence, becoming an irrational impulse like any other delusional form of psychosis."

Yet we should not confuse the cultural precipitate with religious knowledge and experience. Genuine religion can produce many religious cultures and outlive any one of them. A complete identification of religion with its cultural outgrowth leads to violence of the sort produced in the Reformation, where theological issues were confused and exacerbated by cultural disparities between Northern and Latin Europe. Dawson would seem to say that this tendency to identify religion with culture is primarily a result of a failure within the prophetic office of religion to keep the transcendental basis of religion intensely alive. Such a failure was doubtless the root trouble with those evangelizing Christian missionaries of the last century who tended to confuse Christianity with the folkways of the home country and who put store-clothes on the native before he had so much as learned the Nicene Creed.

Following a wonderful survey of world cultures Dawson's conclusion comes home with tremendous impact: "We have a secularized, scientific world culture which is a body without a soul; while on the other hand religion maintains its separate existence as a spirit without a body." We have produced a unique historical predicament which Dawson describes as a "wider, more intense, and more complete secularization of culture than the world has ever known . . . The events of the last few years portend either the end of human history or a turning point in it." It is fair to say that Dawson is the least gloomy of our great philosophic historians. He does not presume to predict deterministically. He knows that human history can turn abruptly and rapidly under the guidance of genuine religious prophets. He rejects Spengler's pagan motto, "Fate leads the willing, drags the unwilling," as Augustine rejected it. He retains the role of the true prophet who allows for the moral choice of free man. But he makes it clear that the alternative to spiritual rebirth is not only spiritual death but rapid material disaster. It is the Christian



virtue of hope to believe that having so much guidance from our "doctors" of the Church, we will also have the dedicated apostolic wills which can rebuild Christendom.

In *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture*, Dawson applies his general thesis to the specific case of Western culture.

He tells the story of the Dark Ages and the High Middle Ages in an incomparably interesting and informed style. It is a twice-told tale for him, and one over which he has worked and meditated until he is at home in every department of its complex history. The wonder of this book is the skill of its selection and arrangement of materials so as to bring out the significance of whole epochs and to allow the original sources to tell their own story. The student of medieval history will find great integrating insights; the beginner will find the account fascinating and understandable. The Catholic reader will be glad to have Dawson's comment on the relation between the "saint cults" of the early Dark Age and the survival of paganism in the Church of that age. His statement about the "otherworldliness" of the Church of that age (pp. 35-36) ought to be memorized and repeated whenever someone starts telling you about the defeatism of medieval Catholicism. The story of the thin thread of Christian learning in the West preserved with supernatural courage against wave after wave of barbarian invaders has never been so well told. A new insight is given us into the central role of the liturgy in preserving a sense of historical order and purpose in the confusion of those tragic ages.

Dawson concludes: "The importance of these centuries of which I have been writing is not to be found in the external order they created or attempted to create, but in the change they brought about in the soul of Western man—a change which can never be entirely undone except by the total negation or destruction of Western man himself."

The final recommendation of the book is that the reader accepts this verdict on the basis of the evidence itself after he has read Dawson's account.

EDWIN HALSEY

### Our Writers

*Ed Halsey*, who makes his first INTEGRITY appearance in this issue, has been a Catholic only about six months but he was ten years working up to it. He is a graduate of Dartmouth, was in the Navy during the war, and is currently doing graduate work in history at Harvard. . . . *Marion Mitchell Stancioff* is also a convert, but from way back. She is an American married to a Bulgarian, a mother of seven children, an artist, writer, cosmopolitan, apostle. . . . We told you who *John Hicks* was last time, a witness to the fact that the spirit breathes where it will. Who would expect to find such devastating criticism of industrialism coming out of the accounting department of an automobile factory? . . . We have a confession to make. We use quite a few pseudonyms in INTEGRITY, for this good reason or that (so someone won't lose his job, for instance). We insist that our writers stick to their aliases. However, we hereby announce that *Elizabeth Williams* is reverting to her real name of *Dorothy Dohen*, which is the name she uses in *THE TORCH* and the name under which Sheed & Ward is going to publish her book in the Fall, *The Vocation to Love*. Dorothy is a New Yorker, a graduate of Mt. St. Vincent, and an inspiration to the local apostolate. . . . We made a mistake last month. *Ernst Winter* is not German, but Austrian.

# The Month

*Edited by the English Jesuits*

In the June, July and August issues of *The Month*  
we are publishing three installments of

## HELENA

the forthcoming novel by

EVELYN WAUGH

Other regular contributors include:

Graham Greene, M.C. D'Arcy, R. A. Knox,  
Christopher Devlin, F. C. Copleston, Roy Campbell,  
Martin Turnell.

In June we are publishing the first in a new series of  
studies of leading contemporary theologians, includ-  
ing Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Barth, Oscar Cullmann,  
Emil Brunner, Bishop Nygren, William Temple.

Annual Subscription \$5.50

**British Publications, Inc.,** 150 East 35th Street, New York 16

I enclose \$..... Please send me **The Month** for one year.

Name.....

Street.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

and  
drawn  
Eucha

Our  
Church  
off the  
with  
green

INTER  
Chris  
for th

Annu

INTER

255.859  
I 418

1230 Old Mission Students' Theol.

her  
the

The  
ing  
son  
the

ned  
gift

.00.

ork